

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Thursday, June 14, 2007 – 2:00 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|--|---|
| Councilman Michael Johnson, Co-Chair,
Phoenix | Robert Schultz, Mesa, representing
the Arts Community |
| # Ed Beasley, Co-Chair, Glendale,
representing the MAG Management
Committee | Dawn Coomer, Scottsdale, representing
the MAG Pedestrian Working Group |
| Robert Yabes, Tempe, representing the
MAG Street Committee | Bill Lazenby, representing the MAG
Regional Bicycle Task Force |
| * Angela Dye, A Dye Design, representing
the American Society of Landscape
Architects, Arizona Chapter | Doug Kupel, Arizona Preservation
Foundation, representing the
Archaeological and Historic Preservation
Community |
- * Not present.
Participated by telephone conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

- | | |
|---|---|
| Kevin Wallace, MAG | Irene Morgan, Town of Wickenburg Mitchell |
| Steve Gross, MAG | Foy, City of Mesa |
| Bob Ciccarelli, Town of Paradise Valley | Sonny Culbreth, City of Litchfield Park |
| R.S. Matt, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists | Paula Moloff, City of Glendale |
| Janeen K. Gaskins, City of Avondale | Randi Alcott, Valley Metro/RPTA |
| Reed Kempton, City of Scottsdale | Steve Hancock, City of Glendale |
| Darryl H. Crossman, City of Litchfield Park | Peggy Rubach, MCDOT |
| Dave Hedlund, City of Litchfield Park | Randall Overmyer, City of Surprise |

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Michael Johnson called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

2. Approval of the April 13, 2007, Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group

Addressing the first order of business, Co-Chair Johnson asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes, and asked for formal approval. Ms. Dawn Coomer moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Bill Lazenby seconded, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Working Group.

3. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Co-Chair Johnson asked members of the Working Group, and those individuals who were in attendance to introduce themselves. He also noted that Mr. Ed Beasley was attending the meeting via telephone conference call.

4. Call to the Audience

Co-Chair Johnson stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience, and moved to the next item on the Agenda.

5. Staff Report

Co-Chair Johnson introduced Mr. Kevin Wallace, MAG Transit Program Manager, to provide an update on current items of interest. Mr. Wallace indicated that MAG received two project letters of support after the applications were mailed to the Working Group, one for the Wickenburg bridge conversion project and one for the Surprise sidewalk project. Mr. Wallace stated that copies of the letters were provided to the Working Group members. Mr. Wallace then noted a correction on Agenda Attachment A, where the federal amount for local projects was incorrect. He indicated the amount should be \$4,502,595 instead of \$6,192,783, which was the total project amount. Mr. Wallace concluded his report by reviewing the project review process outlined in Agenda Attachment B.

6. Schedule for Round XV Transportation Enhancement Funds

Addressing the next order of business, Co-Chair Johnson described the process for hearing each of the applications. Co-Chair Johnson informed the Working Group that a total of five minutes would be allowed for each presentation, which would be followed by a five minute public comment period, and a maximum, ten-minute time frame to allow the Working Group to ask questions and to make necessary comments. Co-Chair Johnson noted that there was a timer located at the podium to assist presenters in keeping within the five minute time limit. Co-Chair Johnson thanked those in attendance and told them that the purpose of today's meeting was to make their applications more competitive at the state level. He then addressed the Working Group and thanked them for their participation in this process, and stated that their assistance

was appreciated. He asked if there were any questions, and then proceeded to the application review process for the projects identified below, which were heard by the Working Group in order.

Town of Paradise Valley – Tatum Boulevard Southbound Left Turn Lane Extension at Lincoln Drive

Mr. Bob Ciccarelli addressed the Working Group, and informed them that traffic routinely backs up at the intersection of Tatum Boulevard and Lincoln Drive, causing traffic delay and congestion. Mr. Ciccarelli indicated that the Town of Paradise Valley would like funding assistance to lengthen the southbound turn pocket on Tatum Boulevard at Lincoln Drive. Mr. Ciccarelli noted that the project would include shortening and re-landscaping of the existing median island.

Ms. Dawn Coomer stated that this project was not eligible for Transportation Enhancement funds, and that it would be a better candidate for CMAQ funds. Mr. Robert Yabes agreed with Ms. Coomer's statement that this project was not eligible under the Transportation Enhancement program. There were no further questions or comments.

Town of Paradise Valley – Lincoln Drive Sidewalk Improvement Project

Mr. Bob Ciccarelli addressed the Working Group, and gave them an overview of the Town of Paradise Valley's application to construct a meandered and separated sidewalk along the south side of Lincoln Drive, from Invergordon Road to the eastern town limits. Mr. Ciccarelli indicated that the proposed facility would be a sidewalk for pedestrians, not a shared use pathway. He also noted that the facility would link the Town Hall with businesses along Lincoln Drive, and would provide a continuous linkage between Phoenix and Scottsdale.

Ms. Coomer noted that the state's review committee will see 80 to 90 applications, and that it is very important to try and sell the project in the response to the first question. She suggested that Mr. Ciccarelli update the general description and include the length of the project. Ms. Coomer also suggested that Mr. Ciccarelli indicate in the application why it was important to install larger trees, especially if it is required by a local code.

Mr. Yabes stated that it would be important to improve the project map, as it was not clear what the map was pointing out. He also suggested a review of the cost estimate for colored concrete, which he indicated might be low. There were no further questions or comments.

Valley Metro/RPTA – Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Education Plan

Ms. Randi Alcott addressed the Working Group, and informed them that Valley Metro had assembled a group of project partners to enhance their current bicycle safety program, both in the valley and throughout the state. Ms. Alcott provided the Working Group with statistics on the average number of bicycle and pedestrian crashes per year. Ms. Alcott then discussed the challenges of developing an effective bicycle and pedestrian safety campaign for this region,

including the large population, rapid growth, heavy traffic, finding a safe route to travel, overcoming the geeky versus cool factors for teenagers, and limited safety education funds. Ms. Alcott explained how Valley Metro's project partners would provide support and input. She indicated that the primary elements of the program would include buying television ads, refining the interactive bike trip planner, and developing highly visible marketing strategies. Ms. Alcott concluded her presentation by discussing the goals to reduce the number of bicycle and pedestrian injuries and fatalities, and to increase awareness of safety laws and rules.

Co-Chair Johnson then called Mr. R. S. Matt from the audience to speak on this agenda item. Mr. Matt introduced himself and indicated that he is a nationally certified bicycle safety instructor and the co-chair of the Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists. Mr. Matt discussed the four principles of reducing bicycle injuries, including following the rules of the road, deterring motorists mistakes, plan of escape, and personal protective gear. Mr. Matt noted that on his bike ride to this meeting, he observed 25 cyclists doing something wrong, which indicates the need for improved bicycle safety education. Mr. Matt concluded his remarks by noting his strong support for this project. There were no questions or comments on this project from the Working Group.

Scottsdale – Arizona Canal Multi-Use Path Project: 64th Street to Goldwater Boulevard

Mr. Reed Kempton addressed the Working Group, and informed them that this project was for a 10 to 12-foot multi-use path along the south bank of the Arizona Canal, between 64th Street and Goldwater Boulevard. Mr. Kempton noted that the total project is 0.9 miles long, and connects other pathway projects that are currently under design and under construction. Mr. Kempton provided an overview of the area and the destinations that would be connected with the completion of the project.

Mr. Yabes noted that similar multi-use projects in Tempe are currently running at \$2 million per mile, and asked Mr. Kempton if \$800,000 would be enough to complete this project. Mr. Kempton responded that it would, because the project is relatively straight and doesn't include intersection improvements.

Mr. Robert Schultz asked if any artist concepts would be included with the project. Mr. Kempton indicated that Scottsdale's code requires a certain percentage of capital project budgets be allocated to public art, and that artists had been included with the project design team. Mr. Bill Lazenby suggested that Mr. Kempton clarify that issue in the final application.

Mr. Doug Kupel noted that this was a very well done application, especially the text, letters, and maps. Co-Chair Johnson agreed, and suggested that other applicants take a look at the Scottsdale application. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Wickenburg – Us-60/93 Hassayampa River Bridge Conversion

Ms. Irene Morgan addressed the Working Group, and gave an overview of this project. Ms. Morgan noted that the purpose of this project was to convert the existing US-60 bridge into a pedestrian bridge, and to restore the existing railroad underpass.

Mr. Kupel brought the Working Group's attention to Question 13 on page eight, and asked Ms. Morgan if either of the bridges, one built in 1937 and the other in 1962, had received consideration for being designated as historic. Ms. Morgan indicated that they had not. Mr. Kupel suggested rewording the response to Question 13 to state that the 1962 bridge is potentially eligible when it reaches 50 years of age, and that the 1937 bridge is eligible for an historic designation, but is not listed on the Register at this time. Mr. Kupel noted that the revised language should also be included for Question 17 on page nine.

Mr. Yabes stated that the funding amounts on items 10 and 11 on page four had been switched. Ms. Morgan agreed that the numbers had inadvertently been switched. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Avondale – I-10/107th Avenue Underpass Enhancement

Ms. Janeen Gaskins addressed the Working Group, and explained that this project would widen the I-10 freeway underpass at 107th Avenue to provide a six to eight-foot wide sidewalk. Ms. Gaskins explained that the enhancement would fall in line with the I-10 expansion project, and would include lighting, utility replacements, landscaping, relocating a retaining wall, and artistic renderings. She stated that the sidewalk would also provide an important connection for numerous businesses and residences in the area. Ms. Gaskins then concluded her presentation by discussing the community benefits of this project in terms of safety, beautification, connectivity to jobs and shopping, and bus connectivity.

Ms. Coomer stated that this should be a state project since it is included within ADOT right-of-way. She then noted that state applications require a letter from the ADOT District Engineer and allow a higher funding level than local projects. Ms. Coomer suggested that Ms. Gaskins talk with Cheryl Banta at ADOT to discuss their Projects of Opportunity grants, which might work for this project. Ms. Coomer then suggested changing the word "biker" in Question 14 to "bicyclist" and indicated that the project budget must follow the ADOT format included with the application.

Mr. Lazenby stated that the application should stress the benefits of closing the north-south gap across I-10.

Mr. Kupel noted the application was vague in stating the project would require five or more utility relocations, and suggested a more specific number. He also stated that the 32-month project schedule was not realistic. Mr. Kupel concluded his remarks by suggesting that the application include more letters of support from citizens, particularly in relation to the public art component.

Mr. Yabes indicated that the vicinity map should show the area destinations to help convey the importance of making this connection.

Co-Chair Johnson reiterated that it would be important to clarify if this was a state project, which would require a letter from the ADOT District Engineer. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Maricopa County – Regional Safe Routes to School Support Center Program

Ms. Peggy Rubach addressed the Working Group, and provided them with an overview of Maricopa County's application. She explained that the regional safe routes to school support center would help address the problems of bicycle and pedestrian crashes and public health. Ms. Rubach discussed the challenges of implementing the program, including the size of Maricopa County, the large number of schools and school districts, and the limited resources for safe routes to school programs. She discussed how the project would address these challenges through cooperative partnerships and by building on proven safety education programs.

Co-Chair Johnson called Mr. R. S. Matt from the audience to speak on this agenda item. Mr. Matt addressed the Working Group by stating that education for bicyclists and pedestrians is nonexistent. He indicated that the region needs programs like this to keep children alive and safe. He also noted that Maricopa County is larger than some states, and while using the media may seem expensive, it is the most effective way to get the word out. Mr. Matt concluded his remarks by expressing his support for this application.

Mr. Kupel noted that the application included a number of agencies that had not officially signed the petition page, and asked if the project would ultimately receive a higher match than the required 5.7% local match. Ms. Rubach indicated that she was working on the local match issue, and would like some direction from the committee on the issue. Ms. Coomer stated that the multi-source overmatch seemed to complicate the application and might not be a good idea. Co-Chair Johnson noted that a large local match often made the state review committee ask why you needed the grant in the first place.

Ms. Coomer then noted that there was a lot of good information in the presentation that should be included in the application. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Litchfield Park – Litchfield Park Trails System Landscape Enhancements

Mr. Darryl Crossman addressed the Working Group, and explained that this project would beautify approximately one mile of the City's trail system in two locations. He then discussed how the project would provide trees, shrubs, cacti, decomposed granite, drip irrigation, benches, and trash receptacles. Mr. Crossman noted that the city has long been a proponent of bicycling and walking, and currently has 12 miles of pathways within the city. Mr. Crossman concluded his presentation by showing the Working Group several images of the proposed enhancement area.

Ms. Coomer noted that the federal aid program is very cumbersome, and questioned whether it would be worth it to request such a small amount of money. Mr. Crossman indicated that this

was an important improvement for the City. Ms. Coomer then suggested adding the length of the trail system in the response to Question 13.

Mr. Kupel said it would be helpful to explain the importance of painting trees in the response to Question 15-A. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Litchfield Park – Litchfield Road and Wigwam Boulevard Pedestrian Underpass and Public Art Project

Mr. Darryl Crossman addressed the Working Group, and explained that this project would involve constructing a pedestrian underpass beneath Litchfield Road at Wigwam Boulevard. He discussed how the 12-foot pathway would incorporate traffic control features and public art, and would provide a critical link for area neighborhoods and schools. Mr. Crossman noted that the project was supported by several agencies, schools, and area residents. Mr. Crossman showed the Working Group several images of the proposed enhancement area, then concluded his presentation by noting that this was the city's number one enhancement project.

Ms. Coomer asked whether the City had considered an at-grade solution. Mr. Crossman indicated that an at-grade solution would likely be more expensive and wouldn't address the safety concerns. Ms. Coomer then indicated that the traffic volumes in the application seemed fairly low to support a grade separated crossing.

Mr. Yabes asked if the City had considered narrowing the street to accommodate pedestrians. Mr. Crossman asked Mr. Dave Hedlund from the City of Litchfield Park to address that question. Mr. Hedlund indicated that the City had not looked at an at-grade crossing, but had looked at both underpass and overpass options. He explained that traffic volumes are relatively low today, but they are expected to grow significantly in the future because of growth in Goodyear to the south and Surprise to the north, and that future plans call for the roadway to be widened to accommodate the increased traffic volumes. Ms. Coomer suggested adding the traffic volume forecasts and information about the area's rapid growth into the application. Mr. Crossman responded that in addition to growth in the surrounding areas, there is a significant amount of vacant land along Litchfield Road that is expected to develop. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Mesa – Bike Shelters Along Bicycle Routes Citywide

Mr. Mitchell Foy addressed the Working Group by noting that the City of Mesa had considered submitting a shared use path project, but wanted to do something different. He then explained that this project would provide 15 bike shelters at locations along existing bike routes and canal easements throughout the city. Mr. Foy noted that eight of the 15 shelters would be located along the Fiesta Paseo, a planned pathway near the Fiesta Mall. Mr. Foy then discussed the amenities that would be provided at each bike shelter, including benches and bike loops, drinking fountains, refuse containers, security lighting, and a roof structure. Mr. Foy showed the Working Group several images of proposed locations for the bike shelters, and concluded his presentation by discussing the top 10 reasons for supporting Mesa's application.

Ms. Coomer indicated that it would be important to clarify in the application that these are not transit shelters. She also suggested making the map larger for improved readability.

Mr. Kupel stated that he appreciated the city's desire to look at a different type of project, but felt the first sentence in the second paragraph of the mayor's letter was overly negative. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Glendale – Maryland Avenue Spot Improvements

Mr. Steve Hancock addressed the Working Group, and explained that Maryland Avenue currently includes a bike route that is not continuous because of a lack of pavement width and various barriers. Mr. Hancock provided an overview of the two proposed spot improvements with this project. First, the project would widen Maryland Avenue between 67th Avenue and 69th Avenue from 22 feet to 36 feet, providing enough pavement for two six-foot bike lanes and two 12-foot travel lanes. The second spot improvement would add a 10-foot concrete multi-use path to connect Discovery Park pathways to Maryland Avenue.

Mr. Lazenby asked if the existing bike lanes on Maryland Avenue were six feet in width. Mr. Hancock responded that the existing bike lanes vary in width from four feet to a seven-foot shared bicycle/parking lane.

Ms. Coomer asked if the small amount of funds requested for this project would be worth going through the federal aid process. Mr. Hancock indicated that it would, because the city had made a promise to its voters to complete this type of project in passing its transportation sales tax.

Ms. Coomer then noted that the application required a project category to be circled in response to Question 12, and that more letters of support would help improve the application. Ms. Coomer also indicated that the bike maps included in the application were a more effective presentation tool than the aerial photographs included in the handouts.

Mr. Kupel noted that the project map in the application included three spot improvement areas, and asked why this project wasn't fixing them all. Mr. Hancock responded that the other spot improvement projects would require land acquisition and a longer time-frame to complete. Mr. Kupel indicated that the application should explain how this project is an important first step in improving the overall Maryland Avenue bicycle corridor. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Surprise – Friendship Bridge Enhancement Design

Mr. Randall Overmyer addressed the Working Group, and explained that this project would enhance the 1,200 linear foot Friendship Bridge, which crosses Agua Fria River. He indicated that this section of Bell Road has some of the highest arterial traffic volumes in the county, with more than 70,000 vehicles per day. Mr. Overmyer discussed the lighting and beautification work proposed for the project, and concluded his presentation by noting that the City was requesting \$310,000 in design funding.

Ms. Dawn Coomer asked MAG staff whether design only projects were eligible for funding under the Transportation Enhancement program. Mr. Wallace indicated that they likely were not, as there wasn't a specific category for design only project. Mr. Wallace then indicated that he would contact ADOT for verification. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

Surprise – US-60/Grand Avenue Sidewalk Improvements: Sunrise Boulevard to Dysart Road

Mr. Randall Overmyer addressed the Working Group, and explained that this project would provide approximately three miles of sidewalk and landscape improvements along Grand Avenue between Sunrise Boulevard and Dysart Road. Mr. Overmyer explained that ADOT is currently developing 30% plans to widen Grand Avenue in this location, and that the proposed enhancement would be integrated with ADOT's final design work. Mr. Overmyer then discussed the importance of making these improvements to maintain pedestrian accessibility along Grand Avenue.

Ms. Coomer asked if there would be bike lanes in the ADOT design for Grand Avenue. Mr. Overmyer said no, that the proposed sidewalk would function as a multi-use path for bicyclists and pedestrians. Ms. Coomer then asked if there would be a sidewalk on the BNSF side. Mr. Overmyer indicated that there would not, because BNSF would need to maintain all of that space for future freight and potential passenger rail improvements. Ms. Coomer suggested adding descriptions to the photographs. She then stated that she did not understand why ADOT doesn't construct sidewalks on its projects, as it's been a requirement since 1991 with the passage of ISTEA.

Mr. Lazenby asked if this was a path project or a sidewalk project. Mr. Overmyer indicated that it was a sidewalk project, and that the city would prefer not to mix bicyclists and pedestrians on a sidewalk, but that wasn't an option because of right-of-way constraints. Mr. Lazenby then asked if ADOT had discussed an IGA for the city to construct the sidewalk. Mr. Overmyer indicated that they had not. He then provided an overview of the planned 1,500 acre BNSF intermodal facility in Surprise. Mr. Yabes asked if the Grand Avenue widening was an RTP project. Mr. Overmyer confirmed that it was, and Mr. Yabes asked why the sidewalks weren't included in the project if it was an arterial widening project. Mr. Overmyer indicated that the project is included in the RTP freeway program, not the arterial street program. There were no further questions or comments from the Working Group.

7. Other Items Relevant to Round XV and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

Co-Chair Johnson addressed the next order of business, and asked whether anyone had any other issues to raise for discussion. There were no comments regarding this item from the Working Group. Co-Chair Johnson said that he would like encourage the applicants to contact MAG to review the Scottsdale application. He then thanked the Working Group members and the applicants for helping make this a very productive meeting. Co-Chair Johnson also thanked Steve Gross for all the work he did in coordinating the meeting.

8. Future Meeting Dates

Co-Chair Johnson stated that the next meeting of the Enhancement Funds Working Group will be held Friday, June 22, 2007 at 10:30 a.m. in the MAG Cholla Room. Co-Chair Johnson stated that the purpose of this meeting would be to rank transportation enhancement fund applications. Co-Chair Johnson stated that if needed, a tentative meeting may be held on June 28, 2007. However, he stated that based on the past couple of years, he didn't think the meeting on June 28 would be necessary. There being no further comments or questions, Co-Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m.